arXiv:hep-th/0407252v3 12 Oct 2004

Flux Vacua Statistics for Two-Parameter Calabi-Yau's

A.Misra and A.Nanda
Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee
Roorkee-247 667, Uttaranchal
India
E-mail:aalokfph,aruunuec@iitr.ernet.in

Abstract

We study the number of flux vacua for type IIB string theory on an orientifold of the Calabi-Yau expressed as a hypersurface in $\mathbf{WCP}^4[1,1,2,2,6]$ by evaluating a suitable integral over the complex-structure moduli space as per the conjecture of Douglas and Ashok. We show that away from the singular conifold locus, one gets a power law, and that the (neighborhood) of the conifold locus indeed acts as an attractor in the (complex structure) moduli space. In the process, we evaluate the periods near the conifold locus. We also study (non)supersymmetric solutions near the conifold locus, and show that supersymmetric solutions near the conifold locus do not support fluxes.

Flux compactification has become an important area of work in string/M-theory enlarging the known families of allowed manifolds that would support fluxes, from Calabi-Yau's and tori, to non-Calabi-Yau and non-Kähler manifolds [1]. The statistical counting of flux-vacua has been conjectured in [2] to be given by a suitable integral over the complex structure moduli space. In this short note, we consider type IIB string theory compactified on an orientifold of a compact two-parameter Calabi-Yau expressed as a hypersurface in $\mathbf{WCP}^4[1,1,2,2,6]$, and evaluate the conjectured integral, away from and near the singular conifold locus. Our work, we believe, addresses for the first time, the crucial issue whether the moduli space integral so central to the Ashok-Douglas conjecture, is solvable in the context of compact Calabi-Yau's whose mirrors involves *more than one* complex strucutre modulus. The same becomes important given the fact that flux compactification in string theory can hope to solve the vacuum selection problem by fixing some or all the moduli which in turn implies fixing of *more than one* (around twenty) undetermined parameters of the standard model.

We show that the integral gives a power law for the number of allowed flux vacua, and that the conifold locus acts as an attractor in the complex-structure moduli space, giving the dominant contribution to the flux-vacua counting. Surprisingly, the result for the latter is very similar to that of the one-parameter Calabi-Yau expressed as a hypersurface in $\mathbf{WCP}^4[1,1,1,1,4]$ in [5]. We also investigate the compatibility of supersymmetry with fluxes, and find that one can not have supersymmtric solutions that also support fluxes near the conifold locus.

According to the conjecture of Ashok and Douglas, the total number of no-scale flux vacua is given by a moduli space ($\mathcal{M}$) integral $(\frac{\chi(X_4)}{24})^{b_3}\int_{\mathcal{M}} det(-R-\omega)$, where X_4 is the elliptically-fibered Calabi-Yau four-fold in F-theory to which the the type IIB orientifold can be uplifted using the prescription of [3]; X_4 for the case at hand is a Calabi-Yau hypersurface in $\mathbf{WCP}^5[1,1,2,2,12,18]$, for which $\chi(X_4)=19,728$[4].

Consider the (moduli) space $FD(\tau)\times\mathcal{M}_{CS}$, where $FD(\tau)$ implies the fundamental domain of the $SL(2,\mathbf{Z})$ group with the complex Teichmuller space parameter τ: $|Re(\tau)|<\frac{1}{2},\ |\tau|>1$, and $\mathcal{M}_{CS}$ is the moduli space of complex structure deformations of a Kähler manifold. We begin with the evaluation of $\int_{\mathcal{M}_{CS}} det(-R-\omega)$, $\mathcal{M}_{CS}$ being the complex-structure moduli space with ϕ,ψ the relevant moduli and ω being the Kähler form, for $|\psi|<<1$ and around $\phi=2$. We show that one gets a power law r^6 for some positive r. For points near the singular conifold locus: $\phi=1-864\psi^6$ (one can similarly consider $\phi=-1-864\psi^6$), the aforementioned moduli-space integral gives a logarithmic result (constant)$1/(lnr+\text{constant})$ when integrated around $|\phi|<<1,\ |1-864\psi^6-\phi|<<1$.

The defining hypersurface for the Calabi-Yau is:

$$x_0^2+x_1^{12}+x_2^{12}+x_3^6+x_4^6-12\psi x_0x_1x_2x_3x_4-2\phi x_1^6x_2^6=0, \tag{1}$$

with $h^{1,1}=2$ and $h^{2,1}=128$. This is invariant under $\mathbf{Z}_2\times\mathbf{Z}_6^2$, and using the Greene-Plesser construction, under this modding, one gets the mirror manifold with $h^{1,1}=128$ and $h^{2,1}=2$. It is thir mirror that we will be considering, or equivalently, as in [4], the moduli that can appear at higher orders, are consistently set to zero. Under the symplectic decomposition of the holomorphic three-form Ω canonical homology $(A_a,B^a,a=1,2,3)$ and cohomology bases (α_a,β^a), defining the periods as $\int_{A_a}\Omega=z^a,\int_{B^a}\Omega=F_a$, such that $\Omega=z^a\alpha_a-F_a\beta^a$. Then, the Kähler potential K is given by: $-ln(-i(\tau-\bar{\tau})-ln(-i\int_{CY}\Omega\wedge\bar{\Omega})=ln(-i(\tau-\bar{\tau}))-ln(-i\Pi^\dagger\Sigma\Pi)$, Π being the six-component period vector and $\Sigma=\left(\begin{array}{cc}0&\mathbf{1}_3\\-\mathbf{1}_3&0\end{array}\right)$.

In the vicinity of $\psi=0$ and ϕ on some regular locus, the period vector Π is given by:

$$\Pi=-(2\pi i)^3\frac{4\sqrt{\pi}}{\Gamma^3(\frac{5}{6})}\left(\begin{array}{cccccc}-1&1&0&0&0&0\\ \frac{3}{2}&\frac{3}{2}&\frac{1}{2}&\frac{1}{2}&-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)&-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\\ 1&0&1&0&0&0\\ 1&0&0&0&0&0\\ -\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)&0&\frac{1}{2}&0&\frac{1}{2}&0\\ \frac{1}{2}&\frac{1}{2}&-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)&\frac{1}{2}&-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)&\frac{1}{2}\end{array}\right)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left[u_{-\frac{1}{6}}(\phi)\begin{pmatrix}1\\0\\e^{\frac{i\pi}{3}}\\0\\e^{\frac{2i\pi}{3}}\\0\end{pmatrix}+e^{\frac{i\pi}{6}}u_{-\frac{1}{6}}(-\phi)\begin{pmatrix}0\\1\\0\\e^{\frac{i\pi}{3}}\\0\\e^{\frac{2i\pi}{3}}\end{pmatrix}\right]\\
&+(2\pi i)^3(12)^2\frac{1}{2\pi}\psi^2\begin{pmatrix}-1&1&0&0&0&0\\ \frac{3}{2}&\frac{3}{2}&\frac{1}{2}&\frac{1}{2}&-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)&-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\\ 1&0&1&0&0&0\\ 1&0&0&0&0&0\\ -\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)&0&\frac{1}{2}&0&\frac{1}{2}&0\\ \frac{1}{2}&\frac{1}{2}&-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)&\frac{1}{2}&-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)&\frac{1}{2}\end{pmatrix}\\
&.\left[u_{-\frac{1}{2}}(\phi)\begin{pmatrix}1\\0\\-1\\0\\1\\0\end{pmatrix}+iu_{-\frac{1}{2}}(-\phi)\begin{pmatrix}0\\1\\0\\-1\\0\\1\end{pmatrix}\right].
\end{aligned}\tag{2}
$$

In (2),

$$
u_\nu(\phi)=(2\phi)^\nu\ {}_2F_1(-\frac{\nu}{2},-\frac{\nu}{2}+\frac{1}{2};1;\frac{1}{\phi^2}),\tag{3}
$$

which can be analytically continued to $\frac{2^\nu}{\pi}\int_{-1}^{1}d\zeta\frac{(\phi-\zeta)^\nu}{\sqrt{1-\zeta^2}}$. We will also require:

$$
u'_\nu(\phi)=2^{-1+\nu}\nu\phi^{-3+\nu}\Big[-(\nu-1)\ {}_2F_1(1-\frac{\nu}{2},\frac{3}{2}-\frac{\nu}{2};2;\frac{1}{\phi^2})+2\phi^2\ {}_2F_1(-\frac{\nu}{2},\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\nu}{2};1;\frac{1}{\phi^2})\Big].\tag{4}
$$

If $x\equiv\phi-2$, then using:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&u_{-\frac{1}{2}}(2)=\frac{128\sqrt{6}\,EllipticK(\frac{2}{3})-32\sqrt{6}\,x\,EllipticK(\frac{2}{3})-9\,\pi\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{5}{4},\frac{7}{4},2,\frac{1}{4})}{384\,\pi},\\
&u_{-\frac{1}{2}}(-\phi)=-iu_{-\frac{1}{2}}(\phi);\\
&u_{-\frac{1}{6}}(2)=\frac{-\left(-576\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{1}{12},\frac{7}{12},1,\frac{1}{4})+48\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{1}{12},\frac{7}{12},1,\frac{1}{4})+7\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{13}{12},\frac{19}{12},2,\frac{1}{4})\right)}{576\,2^{\frac{1}{3}}},\\
&u_{-\frac{1}{6}}(-\phi)=e^{-\frac{i\pi}{6}}u_{-\frac{1}{6}}(\phi),
\end{aligned}\tag{5}
$$

one gets:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Pi = \\
& \{\{\frac{\frac{-i}{18}\,(-1+(-1)^{\frac{1}{12}})\,\pi^{\frac{7}{2}}\,(-576\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{1}{12},\frac{7}{12},1,\frac{1}{4})+48\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{1}{12},\frac{7}{12},1,\frac{1}{4})+7\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{13}{12},\frac{19}{12},2,\frac{1}{4}))}{2^{\frac{1}{3}}\,\Gamma(\frac{5}{6})^3}\}, \\
\{\frac{-i}{72}\,\pi\,(& \frac{2^{\frac{2}{3}}\,((3+2\,i)+4\,(-1)^{\frac{1}{12}}+(-1)^{\frac{7}{12}})\,\pi^{\frac{5}{2}}\,(-576{}_2F_1(\frac{1}{12},\frac{7}{12},1,\frac{1}{4})+48\,x{}_2F_1(\frac{1}{12},\frac{7}{12},1,\frac{1}{4})+7\,x{}_2F_1(\frac{13}{12},\frac{19}{12},2,\frac{1}{4}))}{\Gamma(\frac{5}{6})^3} \\
& -108\,\psi^2\,(-128\,\sqrt{6}\,EllipticK(\frac{2}{3})+32\,\sqrt{6}\,x\,EllipticK(\frac{2}{3})+9\,\pi\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{5}{4},\frac{7}{4},2,\frac{1}{4})))\}, \\
& \{\frac{(\frac{1}{18}-\frac{i}{18})\,\pi^{\frac{7}{2}}\,(-576\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{1}{12},\frac{7}{12},1,\frac{1}{4})+48\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{1}{12},\frac{7}{12},1,\frac{1}{4})+7\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{13}{12},\frac{19}{12},2,\frac{1}{4}))}{2^{\frac{1}{3}}\,\Gamma(\frac{5}{6})^3}\}, \\
& \{\frac{-i}{36}\,\pi\,(\frac{2^{\frac{2}{3}}\,\pi^{\frac{5}{2}}\,(-576\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{1}{12},\frac{7}{12},1,\frac{1}{4})+48\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{1}{12},\frac{7}{12},1,\frac{1}{4})+7\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{13}{12},\frac{19}{12},2,\frac{1}{4}))}{\Gamma(\frac{5}{6})^3} \\
& -54\,\psi^2\,(-128\,\sqrt{6}\,EllipticK(\frac{2}{3})+32\,\sqrt{6}\,x\,EllipticK(\frac{2}{3})+9\,\pi\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{5}{4},\frac{7}{4},2,\frac{1}{4})))\}, \\
& \{\frac{i}{72}\,\pi\,(\frac{2^{\frac{2}{3}}\,\pi^{\frac{5}{2}}\,(-576\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{1}{12},\frac{7}{12},1,\frac{1}{4})+48\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{1}{12},\frac{7}{12},1,\frac{1}{4})+7\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{13}{12},\frac{19}{12},2,\frac{1}{4}))}{\Gamma(\frac{5}{6})^3} \\
- \quad & 54\,\psi^2\,(-128\,\sqrt{6}\,EllipticK(\frac{2}{3})+32\,\sqrt{6}\,x\,EllipticK(\frac{2}{3})+9\,\pi\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{5}{4},\frac{7}{4},2,\frac{1}{4})))\}, \\
& \{\frac{-i}{72}\,\pi\,(\frac{2^{\frac{2}{3}}\,(1+(-1)^{\frac{7}{12}})\,\pi^{\frac{5}{2}}\,(-576\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{1}{12},\frac{7}{12},1,\frac{1}{4})+48\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{1}{12},\frac{7}{12},1,\frac{1}{4})+7\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{13}{12},\frac{19}{12},2,\frac{1}{4}))}{\Gamma(\frac{5}{6})^3} \\
& -108\,\psi^2\,(-128\,\sqrt{6}\,EllipticK(\frac{2}{3})+32\,\sqrt{6}\,x\,EllipticK(\frac{2}{3})+9\,\pi\,x\ \ {}_2F_1(\frac{5}{4},\frac{7}{4},2,\frac{1}{4})))\}\}
\end{aligned}
\tag{6}
$$

Using the numerical values of various quantities, the expression of the Kähler potential excluding the axion-dilaton modulus, is given by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& K=-ln(-i(\tau-\bar{\tau})-ln\Bigg[(1.65278\times10^{6}+2.32831\times10^{-10}\,i)+(762417-546469\,i)\,\psi^2- \\
& (163034+2.91038\times10^{-11}\,i)\,x-(236957-169840\,i)\,\psi^2\,x+(762417+546469\,i)\,\bar{\psi}^2+ \\
& -(75206.6+53904.9\,i)\,x\,\bar{\psi}^2-(2.32831\times10^{-10}\,i)\,|\psi|^4\,x+-(163034-2.91038\times10^{-11}\,i)\,\bar{x} \\
& -(75206.6-53904.9\,i)\,\psi^2\,\bar{x}+(16082.1-1.81899\times10^{-12}\,i)\,|x|^2+(23373.9-16753.4\,i)\,\psi^2\,|x|^2
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-(236957+169840\,i)\,\bar{\psi}^2\,\bar{x}+(2.32831\times 10^{-10}\,i)\,|\psi|^4\,\bar{x}+(23373.9+16753.4\,i)\,|x|^2\,\bar{\psi}^2\Bigg]\\
&\equiv -ln(-i(\tau-\bar{\tau})+ln\Bigg[A+(a_1\psi^2+\bar{a}_1\bar{\psi}^2)+(b_1x+\bar{b}_1\bar{x})+(c_1\psi^2x+\bar{c}_1\bar{\psi}^2\bar{x})+(c_2x\bar{\psi}^2+\bar{c}_2\bar{x}\psi^2)\\
&+(c_3|x|^2\psi^2+\bar{c}_3|x|^2\bar{\psi}+c_4|x|^2\Bigg],
\end{aligned}
\tag{7}
$$

where we drop $Im(A)\sim 10^{-10}$, $Im(c_4)\sim 10^{-12}$ and a $c_5|\psi|^4x+\bar{c}_5|\psi|^4\bar{x}$ term with $Rec_5=0, Imc_5\sim 10^{-121}$. From (7), one gets the metric:

$$
g_{i\bar{j}}=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-\frac{1}{(\tau-\bar{\tau})^2} & 0 & 0\\
0 & -4\frac{|a_1|^2}{A^2}|\psi|^2 & 2\psi(\frac{\bar{c}_2}{A}-\frac{a_1\bar{b}_1}{A^2})\\
0 & 2\bar{\psi}(\frac{\bar{c}_2}{A}-\frac{\bar{a}_1b_1}{A^2}) & -\frac{|b_1|^2}{A^2}+\frac{c_4}{A}
\end{array}\right).
\tag{8}
$$

One then can calculate the curvature 2-form: ${R^m}_{j\bar{k}l}dz^j\wedge d\bar{z}^{\bar{k}}$ using that for a Kähler manifold, ${R^m}_{j\bar{k}l}=\frac{\partial\Gamma^m_{jl}}{\partial\bar{z}^k}=\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{z}^k}\Bigg(g^{m\bar{n}}(\partial_jg_{l\bar{n}}+\partial_lg_{j\bar{n}})\Bigg)$. So, using the metric of (8), one gets:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&{R^m}_{x\bar{x}l}={R^m}_{\psi\bar{x}l}={R^m}_{x\bar{\psi}l}=0;\\
&{R^\psi}_{\psi\bar{\psi}\psi}=\frac{1}{\bar{\psi}^2}\frac{(\frac{\bar{c}_2}{A}-\frac{a_1\bar{b}_1}{A^2})^2}{4[\frac{|a_1|^2}{A^2}(\frac{|b_1|^2}{A^2}-\frac{c_4}{A})-|\frac{c_2}{A}-\frac{\bar{a}_1b_1}{A^2}|^2]},\\
&{R^x}_{\psi\bar{\psi}\psi}=\frac{2|a_1|^2}{4[\frac{|a_1|^2}{A^2}(\frac{|b_1|^2}{A^2}-\frac{c_4}{A})-|\frac{c_2}{A}-\frac{\bar{a}_1b_1}{A^2}|^2]A^2\psi}(\frac{\bar{c}_2}{A}-\frac{a_1\bar{b}_1}{A^2}),\\
&{R^x}_{\psi\bar{\psi}x}={R^\psi}_{\psi\bar{\psi}x}=0,
\end{aligned}
\tag{9}
$$

One thus gets:

$$
R^m_l=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-\frac{2}{(\tau-\bar{\tau})^2}d\tau\wedge d\bar{\tau} & 0 & 0\\
0 & \frac{1}{\bar{\psi}^2}\frac{(\frac{\bar{c}_2}{A}-\frac{a_1\bar{b}_1}{A^2})}{4[\frac{|a_1|^2}{A^2}(\frac{|b_1|^2}{A^2}-\frac{c_4}{A})-|\frac{c_2}{A}-\frac{\bar{a}_1b_1}{A^2}|^2]}d\psi\wedge d\bar{\psi} & 0\\
0 & \frac{2|a_1|^2(\frac{\bar{c}_2}{A}-\frac{\bar{a}_1b_1}{A^2})}{4A^2\psi[\frac{|a_1|^2}{A^2}(\frac{|b_1|^2}{A^2}-\frac{c_4}{A})-|\frac{c_2}{A}-\frac{\bar{a}_1b_1}{A^2}|^2]}d\psi\wedge d\bar{\psi} & 0
\end{array}\right),
\tag{10}
$$

---

[1] Of course $ln[-i\Pi^\dagger\Sigma\Pi]$ is real - the fact that one gets infinitesimal, but non-zero imaginary parts as well, seems to be an artefact of using Mathematica.

One can show that $R_{j\bar{k}} = \partial_j\bar{\partial}_{\bar{k}}det(g_{i\bar{j}})$, is a hermitian matrix, i.e., $\bar{R}_{k\bar{j}} = R_{j\bar{k}}$ or equivalently $i\partial\bar{\partial}lndet(g_{i\bar{j}})$ is a hermitian form. However, $R^m_l \equiv R^m_{j\bar{k}l}dz^j \wedge d\bar{z}^{\bar{k}}$ is not a hermitian form.[2]

For the Kähler metric corresponding to the Kähler potential of (7), one gets:$R_{j\bar{k}} = \partial_j\bar{\partial}_{\bar{k}}ln\left(\frac{|\psi|^2}{(\tau-\bar{\tau})^2}\right)$, i.e.,

$$R_{j\bar{k}} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{(\tau-\bar{\tau})^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{11}$$

is hermitian, as expected.

One has to evaluate $det(R+\omega)$ which means one has to evaluate the determinant of:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\begin{pmatrix} R^{\tau}_{\tau\bar{\tau}\tau}d\tau\wedge d\bar{\tau} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & {R^{\psi}}_{\psi\bar{\psi}\psi}d\psi\wedge d\bar{\psi} & {R^{\psi}}_{\psi\bar{\psi}x}d\psi\wedge d\bar{\psi} \\ 0 & {R^{x}}_{\psi\bar{\psi}\psi}d\psi\wedge d\bar{\psi} & {R^{x}}_{\psi\bar{\psi}x}d\psi\wedge d\bar{\psi} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & {R^{\psi}}_{\psi\bar{x}\psi}d\psi\wedge d\bar{x} & {R^{\psi}}_{\psi\bar{x}x}d\psi\wedge d\bar{x} \\ 0 & {R^{x}}_{\psi\bar{x}\psi}d\psi\wedge d\bar{x} & {R^{x}}_{\psi\bar{x}x}d\psi\wedge d\bar{x} \end{pmatrix} \\
&+ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & {R^{\psi}}_{x\bar{\psi}\psi}dx\wedge d\bar{\psi} & {R^{\psi}}_{x\bar{\psi}x}dx\wedge d\bar{\psi} \\ 0 & {R^{x}}_{x\bar{\psi}\psi}dx\wedge d\bar{\psi} & {R^{x}}_{x\bar{\psi}x}dx\wedge d\bar{\psi} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & {R^{\psi}}_{x\bar{x}\psi}dx\wedge d\bar{x} & {R^{\psi}}_{x\bar{x}x}dx\wedge d\bar{x} \\ 0 & {R^{x}}_{x\bar{x}\psi}dx\wedge d\bar{x} & {R^{x}}_{x\bar{x}x}dx\wedge d\bar{x} \end{pmatrix} \\
&+ \begin{pmatrix} g_{\tau\bar{\tau}}d\tau\wedge d\bar{\tau} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g_{\tau\bar{\tau}}d\tau\wedge d\bar{\tau} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{\tau\bar{\tau}}d\tau\wedge d\bar{\tau} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} g_{\psi\bar{\psi}}d\psi\wedge d\bar{\psi} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g_{\psi\bar{\psi}}d\psi\wedge d\bar{\psi} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{\psi\bar{\psi}}d\psi\wedge d\bar{\psi} \end{pmatrix} \\
&+ \begin{pmatrix} g_{\psi\bar{x}}d\psi\wedge d\bar{x} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g_{\psi\bar{x}}d\psi\wedge d\bar{x} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{\psi\bar{x}}d\psi\wedge d\bar{x} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} g_{x\bar{\psi}}dx\wedge d\bar{\psi} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g_{x\bar{\psi}}dx\wedge d\bar{\psi} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{x\bar{\psi}}dx\wedge d\bar{\psi} \end{pmatrix} \\
&+ \begin{pmatrix} g_{x\bar{x}}dx\wedge d\bar{x} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g_{x\bar{x}}dx\wedge d\bar{x} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{x\bar{x}}dx\wedge d\bar{x} \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

One thus gets:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{FD\times\mathcal{M}_{CS}} det(R+\omega) = \int_{FD}(R^{\tau}_{\tau\bar{\tau}\tau} + g_{\tau\bar{\tau}})d\tau\wedge d\bar{\tau} \\
&\wedge\int_{\mathcal{M}_{CS}}\Big[({R^{\psi}}_{\psi\bar{\psi}\psi} + g_{\psi\bar{\psi}})({R^{x}}_{x\bar{x}x} + g_{x\bar{x}}) - ({R^{\psi}}_{\psi\bar{x}\psi} + g_{\psi\bar{x}})({R^{x}}_{x\bar{\psi}x} + g_{x\bar{\psi}}) - ({R^{\psi}}_{x\bar{\psi}\psi} + g_{x\bar{\psi}})({R^{x}}_{\psi\bar{x}x} + g_{\psi\bar{x}}) \\
&+({R^{\psi}}_{x\bar{x}\psi} + g_{x\bar{x}})({R^{x}}_{\psi\bar{\psi}x} + g_{\psi\bar{\psi}}) - {R^{\psi}}_{\psi\bar{\psi}x}{R^{x}}_{x\bar{x}\psi} + {R^{\psi}}_{\psi\bar{x}x}{R^{x}}_{x\bar{\psi}\psi} + {R^{\psi}}_{x\bar{\psi}x}{R^{x}}_{\psi\bar{x}\psi}
\end{aligned}$$

---

[2] We thank D.Joyce for discussion on this point.

$$-R^{\psi}{}_{x\bar{x}x}R^{x}{}_{\psi\bar{\psi}\psi}\Bigg] d\psi\wedge d\bar{\psi}\wedge dx\wedge d\bar{x} \tag{13}$$

One thus sees that moduli space integral factorizes into an integral over the fundamental domain of $SL(2,\mathbf{Z})$, and an integral over the complex structure moduli space. Given that the former will give only a multiplicative contribution, in the following, we will concentrate only on the complex structure moduli space integral.

Assuming that one performs the angular integrals first and then the radial integrals, one gets:

$$\int det(R+\omega)\sim\int_{|x|\leq r_x;\ |\psi|\leq r_\psi}(|\psi|^2)|x|d|x|d\theta_x|\psi|d|\psi|d\theta_\psi\sim r_x^4r_\psi^2\overset{r_x=r_\psi=L}{\longrightarrow}L^6. \tag{14}$$

It is interesting that the power is exactly equal to $2h^{1,1}(CY_3)+2$.

For points near the singular conifold locus: $\phi=1-864\psi^6$, the period vector Π is given Y:

$$\Pi=\begin{pmatrix}-1&1&0&0&0&0\\ \frac{3}{2}&\frac{3}{2}&\frac{1}{2}&\frac{1}{2}&-\frac{1}{2}&-\frac{1}{2}\\ 1&0&1&0&0&0\\ 1&0&0&0&0&0\\ -\frac{1}{2}&0&\frac{1}{2}&0&\frac{1}{2}&0\\ \frac{1}{2}&\frac{1}{2}&-\frac{1}{2}&\frac{1}{2}&-\frac{1}{2}&\frac{1}{2}\end{pmatrix}\cdot\begin{pmatrix}\omega_0\\ \omega_1\\ \omega_2\\ \omega_3\\ \omega_4\\ \omega_5\end{pmatrix}, \tag{15}$$

where w_i's are to be determined as follows. Using [6, 4], in the neighborhood of the conifold locus:

$$\begin{aligned}w_{2j}&=-\frac{1}{6\pi^3}\sum_{r=1}^{6}sin^2\Big(\frac{r\pi}{6}\Big)sin\Big(\frac{r\pi}{2}\Big)e^{\frac{2ijr\pi}{6}}\xi^r_{2j},\\ w_{2j+1}&=-\frac{1}{6\pi^3}\sum_{r=1}^{6}sin^2\Big(\frac{r\pi}{6}\Big)sin\Big(\frac{r\pi}{2}\Big)e^{\frac{i\pi(2j+1)r}{6}}\xi^r_{2j+1},\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\xi^r_{2j}&=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{(\Gamma[n+\frac{r}{6}])^3\Gamma[3(n+\frac{r}{6})]}{\Gamma[6(n+\frac{r}{6})]}(-)^n(12\psi)^{6n+r}u_{-(n+\frac{r}{6})}(\phi),\\ \xi^r_{2j+1}&=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{(\Gamma[n+\frac{r}{6}])^3\Gamma[3(n+\frac{r}{6})]}{\Gamma[6(n+\frac{r}{6})]}(12\psi)^{6n+r}u_{-(n+\frac{r}{6})}(-\phi).\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

. Now using the Stirling asymptotic series for the gamma function: $\Gamma(z) \overset{|z|\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{z}}\Big(\frac{z}{e}\Big)^z\Big(1+\frac{1}{12z}+\mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{1}{z^2}\Big)\Big)$, and the following expressions for $u_\nu(\phi)$ for large $|\nu|$:

$$\begin{aligned}
u_\nu(\phi) &\overset{|\nu|\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \frac{2^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{\pi\nu}}\Big[(1+\phi)^{\nu+\frac{1}{2}} - i(\phi-1)^{\nu+\frac{1}{2}}\Big],\\
u_\nu(-\phi) &\overset{|\nu|\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \frac{2^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{\pi\nu}}\Big[e^{i\pi\nu}(1+\phi)^{\nu+\frac{1}{2}} - ie^{-i\pi\nu}(\phi-1)^{\nu+\frac{1}{2}}\Big],
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

one gets the following asymptotic expression for $\frac{\partial^2 w_i}{\partial\psi^2}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2 w_i}{\partial\psi^2} &= \frac{9}{\pi^2\psi^2}\frac{c_i(1-\phi)}{(1-864\psi^6-\phi)},\ \text{where}\\
c_{2j} &\equiv \frac{4i}{3}\sum_{r=1}^{6} sin^2\Big(\frac{\pi r}{6}\Big)sin\Big(\frac{\pi r}{2}\Big)e^{\frac{i(2j-1)\pi r}{6}}(-)^r,\\
c_{2j+1} &\equiv \frac{4i}{3}\sum_{r=1}^{6} sin^2\Big(\frac{\pi r}{6}\Big)sin\Big(\frac{\pi r}{2}\Big)e^{\frac{i(2j+1)\pi r}{6}}(-)^r.
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

One can show that $c_i = (1, 1, -1, -2, 2, 1)$[6, 4]. [3] One thus gets:

$$w_i = \frac{c_i}{2\pi i}\Big(\frac{2\pi i}{4\pi^2}\frac{(1-864\psi^6-\phi)}{(1-\phi)^2}\Big)ln(1-864\psi^6-\phi) + f_i(\phi,\psi), \tag{20}$$

where $f_i(\phi,\psi)$ are analytic functions of ϕ and ψ. Now, the monodromy properties, as discussed in [7, 4] imply that:

$$w_i = \frac{c_i}{2\pi i}(w_0-w_1)ln(1-864\psi^6-\phi) + f_i(\phi,\psi). \tag{21}$$

This implies $w_0 - w_1 = f_0 - f_1$. To determine f_i, we use the fact that for $|\phi| << 1,\ |\psi| << 1$, one can expand f_i as: $f_i = \sum_{n,m} a_{n,m}\phi^n\psi^m$ [7]. In the neighborhood of the conifold locus, the analytic part of the periods $f_i(\phi,\psi)$ will be given by: $f_0(e^{6ij\pi\phi}, e^{\frac{ij\pi}{6}}\psi)$, $j = 0, ..., 5$, where $f_0(\phi,\psi)$ is given by $(x \equiv 1-864\psi^6-\phi)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
f_0(\phi,x) &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{a_{0,m}}{(864)^m}(-)^{\frac{m}{6}} + \Big(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{a_{1,m}}{(864)^m}(-)^{\frac{m}{6}} - \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{ma_{0,m}}{(864)^m}(-)^{\frac{m}{6}}\Big)\phi\\
&-x\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{ma_{0,m}}{(864)^m}(-)^{\frac{m}{6}} + \mathcal{O}(x^2,\phi^2,x\phi).
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

---

[3] If one includes the $\frac{1}{12z}$ in the Stirling expression for $\Gamma(z)$, one will get a $ln(1-864\psi^6-\phi)$ term in addition to the $\frac{1}{(1-864\psi^6-\phi)}$ in $\frac{\partial^2 w_i}{\partial\psi^2}$.

In general,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&f_0(\phi,\psi) = -\frac{1}{6}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{6})(-12\psi)^n u_{-\frac{n}{6}}(\phi)}{\Gamma(n)(\Gamma[1-\frac{n}{6}])^2\Gamma[1-\frac{n}{12}]},\\
&\text{where}\\
&u_{-\frac{n}{6}}(\phi) = \frac{e^{\frac{-in\pi}{12}}}{2\Gamma(\frac{n}{6})}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\frac{e^{\frac{i\pi m}{2}}\Gamma(\frac{6m+n}{12})(2\phi)^m}{m!\Gamma(1-\frac{6m+n}{12})}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{23}
$$

Now, from (20), one sees that $f_0 - f_1 \equiv \alpha x + \beta x\phi + ...$, $x \equiv 1 - 864\psi^6 - \phi$, and

$$
a_{0,m} = -\frac{1}{12}\frac{(-12)^m e^{\frac{-i\pi m}{12}}\Gamma(\frac{m}{12})}{\Gamma(m)(\Gamma[1-\frac{m}{12}])^2(\Gamma[1-\frac{m}{6}])^2}.
\tag{24}
$$

The numerical values of the relevant infinite series are:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{a_{0,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} = -11.6 - 0.5i,\\
&12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{a_{0,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}n}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} = -1.9 - 1.2i,\\
&12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{\frac{i\pi n}{6}}a_{0,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} = -13.3 - 1.4i,\\
&12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{\frac{i\pi n}{6}}a_{0,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}n}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} = -1.5 + 6.2i,\\
&12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{\frac{i\pi n}{3}}a_{0,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} = -20.5 - 3.5i,\\
&12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{\frac{i\pi n}{3}}a_{0,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}n}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} = -12.1 + 24.4i,\\
&12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{\frac{i\pi n}{2}}a_{0,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} = -34.2 - 25.9i,\\
&12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{\frac{i\pi n}{2}}a_{0,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}n}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} = -82.5 + 7.7i,\\
&12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{\frac{2i\pi n}{3}}a_{0,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}n}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} = -7.1 - 82.5i,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{\frac{2i\pi n}{3}}a_{0,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}n}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} &= -58.7-138i,\\
12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{\frac{5i\pi n}{6}}a_{0,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} &= 81.6-50.2i,\\
12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{\frac{5i\pi n}{6}}a_{0,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}n}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} &= -156.6-126.2i,
\end{aligned}
\tag{25}
$$

Similarly,

$$
a_{1,m} = -\frac{1}{12}\frac{(-12)^m e^{\frac{-i\pi m}{12}}\Gamma(\frac{m+6}{12})}{\Gamma(m)(\Gamma[1-\frac{m+6}{12}])\Gamma[1-\frac{m}{12}](\Gamma[1-\frac{m}{6}])^2},
\tag{26}
$$

and the relevant numerical values of the series are:

$$
\begin{aligned}
12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{a_{1,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} &= -0.471-0.574i,\\
12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{\frac{in\pi}{6}}e^{i\pi}a_{1,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} &= 0.396-0.449i,\\
12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{a_{1,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}e^{\frac{in\pi}{3}}e^{2i\pi}}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} &= -1.57+0.972i,\\
12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{a_{1,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}e^{\frac{in\pi}{2}}e^{3i\pi}}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} &= -8.421+7.4362i,\\
12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{a_{1,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}e^{\frac{2in\pi}{3}}e^{4i\pi}}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} &= 15.204+6.422i,\\
12\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{a_{1,n}(-)^{\frac{n}{6}}e^{\frac{5in\pi}{6}}e^{5i\pi}}{(864)^{\frac{n}{6}}} &= -18.289i.
\end{aligned}
\tag{27}
$$

One thus gets:

$$
\begin{pmatrix} f_0\\ f_1\\ f_2\\ f_3\\ f_4\\ f_5 \end{pmatrix}
= \frac{1}{12}
\begin{pmatrix}
-11.6-0.5i & 2.811+1.626i & 1.9+1.2i\\
-13.3-1.4i & 1.896-6.649i & 1.5-6.2i\\
-20.5-3.5i & 10.53-2.842i & 12.1-24.4i\\
-34.2-25.9i & 7.079-0.264i & 8.25-7.7i\\
-7.1-82.5i & 73.904+144.422i & 58.7+138i\\
81.6-50.2i & 156.6+107.911i & 156.6+126.2i
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix} 1\\ \phi\\ x \end{pmatrix}
\tag{28}
$$

From the asymptotic analysis done earlier, writing $f_i = a_i^{(0)} + a_i^{(1)}\phi + a_i^{(2)}x + \mathcal{O}(\phi^2, x^2, x\phi)$, one knows that $f_0 - f_1 = (a_0^{(2)} - a_1^{(2)})x + \mathcal{O}(\phi^2, x^2, x\phi)$. From (28), one sees that this is approximately satisfied if one drops the imaginary part of f_0 (to an accuracy of about 95%) and also the imaginary part of f_1 (to an accuracy of 89.5%) and assumes that $\phi \to 0, x \to 0 : \frac{\phi}{x} \to 0$. One then gets, $f_0 - f_1 = \frac{7.4}{12}ix + \mathcal{O}(\phi^2, x^2, \phi x)$ (up to 94.5% accuracy). Given that the periods can be regarded as the solutions to the homogeneous Picard-Fuchs equation, this implies that a constant times the period vectors will also be valid period vectors. Consequently, one can do a further rescaling of the periods: $w_i \to \frac{1}{2\pi}(\frac{12}{7.4})w_i$, to get a match with (20).

The Kähler potential is thus given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
&K = -ln(-i(\tau - \bar{\tau}) - ln(-i\Pi^\dagger \Sigma \Pi) = \\
&-ln(-i(\tau - \bar{\tau})) - ln\Big[-i\Big(\frac{1}{2\pi}|f_0 - f_1|^2 ln|x|^2 + \mathrm{Re}(\frac{1}{2}[3\bar{f}_0 + 3\bar{f}_1 + \bar{f}_2 + \bar{f}_3 - \bar{f}_4 - \bar{f}_5][-f_0 + f_2 + f_4] \\
&+[\bar{f}_0 + \bar{f}_2][f_0 + f_1 - f_2 + f_3 - f_4 + f_5]\Big)\Big] \\
&\equiv -ln(-i(\tau - \bar{\tau}) + \alpha|x|^2 ln|x|^2 + A + (Bx + \bar{B}\bar{x}) + (C\phi + \bar{C}\bar{\phi}) + D|x|^2 + E|\phi|^2 \\
&+(F\bar{x}\phi + \bar{F}x\bar{\phi}) + (G\phi^2 + \bar{G}\bar{\phi}^2), \qquad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Sigma \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{1}_3 \\ -\mathbf{1}_3 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, and we have considered terms in the Kähler potential up to quadratic in x, ϕ (and their complex conjugates and the products of the same). Using $g_{i\bar{j}} = \partial_i \bar{\partial}_j K$ and from our experience from points away from the conifold locus, we realize that we can exclude the axion-dilaton modulus as it will have only an overall multiplicative effect in the moduli space integral. Thus, one gets:

$$\begin{aligned}
g^{CS}_{i\bar{j}} &= \begin{pmatrix} g_{x\bar{x}} & g_{x\bar{\phi}} \\ g_{\phi\bar{x}} & g_{\phi\bar{\phi}} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\alpha}{A}ln|x|^2 + \frac{|B|^2}{A^2} - \frac{\alpha+D}{A} & \frac{\bar{C}B}{A} \\ \frac{C\bar{B}}{A} & \frac{|C|^2}{A^2} - \frac{E}{A} \end{pmatrix}. \qquad (30)
\end{aligned}$$

Writing

$$\begin{aligned}
&det g^{CS} = -\frac{\alpha}{A}\Big(\frac{|C|^2}{A^2} - \frac{E}{A}\Big)ln|x|^2 + \Big(\frac{|C|^2}{A^2} - \frac{E}{A}\Big)\Big(\frac{|B|^2}{A^2} - \frac{(\alpha + D)}{A}\Big) - \frac{|C\bar{B}|^2}{A^2} \\
&\equiv \Lambda_1 ln|x|^2 + \Lambda_2, \qquad (31)
\end{aligned}$$

one gets:

$$R^{CS} = \begin{pmatrix} R^x{}_{x\bar{x}x} dx \wedge d\bar{x} & R^x{}_{x\bar{x}\phi} dx \wedge d\bar{x} \\ R^\phi{}_{x\bar{x}x} dx \wedge d\bar{x} & R^\phi{}_{x\bar{x}\phi} dx \wedge d\bar{x} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \frac{1}{(\Lambda_1 ln|x|^2 + \Lambda_2)^2} \begin{pmatrix} \left(\frac{|C|^2}{A^2} - \frac{E}{A}\right)\frac{\alpha\Lambda_1}{A|x|^2} dx \wedge d\bar{x} & 0 \\ -\frac{C\bar{B}\alpha\Lambda_1}{A^2} dx \wedge d\bar{x} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{32}$$

which even though is not hermitian, the corresponding $R_{i\bar{j}} = \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} lndetg = \partial_i \partial_j ln(\frac{[\Lambda_1 ln|x|^2 + \Lambda_2]}{(\tau - \bar{\tau})^2})$, hence given by:

$$R_{i\bar{j}} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{(\tau-\bar{\tau})^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{\frac{\Lambda_1^2}{|x|^2}}{(\Lambda_1 ln|x|^2 + \Lambda_2)^2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{33}$$

is hermitian. Dropping the Kähler form as compared to the curvature two-form, as $x \rightarrow 0$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} det(R + \omega) \sim \int_{|x| < r_x} \int_{|\phi| < r_\phi} |x| d|x| |\phi| d|\phi| \frac{\text{Constant}}{|x|^2 (ln|x|^2 + \frac{\Lambda_2}{\Lambda_1})^2} = -\frac{r_\phi^2 (\text{Constant})}{(ln r_x + \frac{\Lambda_2}{2\Lambda_1})}. \tag{34}$$

One thus sees, that the contribution from the conifold locus to the complex structure moduli space integral dominates over the contribution from points away from the singular conifold locus, as expected. The conifold locus, thus, acts as an attractor in the complex structure moduli space.

Lets now consider the (non)supersymmetric solutions, implying that we look for solutions to:

$$W = D_\tau W = D_x W = D_\phi W = 0 \tag{35}$$

W being the superpotential, given by:

$$W = \int_{CY} (F - \tau H) \wedge \Omega = (2\pi)^2 \alpha' (f - \tau h) \cdot \Pi, \tag{36}$$

where one uses that the $NS - NS$ flux H and the RR flux F are given by: $F = (2\pi)^2 \alpha' (\mathcal{F}_a \beta_a + \mathcal{F}_{a+3} \alpha_a)$ and $H = (2\pi)^2 \alpha' (\mathcal{H}_a \beta_a + \mathcal{H}_{a+3} \alpha_a)$, α_a, β^a forming an integral cohomology basis, $a = 1, 2, 3$. For nonsupersymmetric solutions, $W \neq 0$. Now, $W = 0$ together with

$$D_\tau W = \partial_\tau W + \partial_\tau K W = -\frac{1}{(\tau - \bar{\tau})} (\mathcal{F}^T \Pi - \bar{\tau} \mathcal{H}^T \Pi) = 0, \tag{37}$$

implies

$$\mathcal{F}^T \bar{\Pi} = \mathcal{H}^T \bar{\Pi} = 0. \tag{38}$$

The analysis below is applicable for nonsupersymmetric solutions, however for supersymmetric solutions, after doing the analysis below from (41)-(43), one notes that if in $\mathcal{F}^T$ and $\mathcal{H}^T$, one sets

$\mathcal{F}_4 = \mathcal{H}_4 = 0$, then one can write $\mathcal{F}^T\Pi = \mathcal{H}^T\Pi = 0$ These conditions translate to:

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{ix}{2\pi}\mathcal{F}_1 + \frac{\mathcal{F}_2}{2}(3f_0 + 3f_1 + f_2 + f_3 - f_4 - f_5) + \mathcal{F}_3(f_0 + f_2) + \frac{\mathcal{F}_5}{2}(-f_0 + f_2 + f_4)\\
&+\frac{\mathcal{F}_6}{2}(f_0 + f_1 - f_2 + f_3 - f_4 + f_5) = 0\\
&-\frac{ix}{2\pi}\mathcal{H}_1 + \frac{\mathcal{H}_2}{2}(3f_0 + 3f_1 + f_2 + f_3 - f_4 - f_5) + \mathcal{H}_3(f_0 + f_2) + \frac{\mathcal{H}_5}{2}(-f_0 + f_2 + f_4)\\
&+\frac{\mathcal{H}_6}{2}(f_0 + f_1 - f_2 + f_3 - f_4 + f_5) = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\mathcal{F}_2}{2}(3a_0^{(0)} + 3a_1^{(0)} + a_2^{(0)} + a_3^{(0)} - a_4^{(0)} - a_5^{(0)}) + \mathcal{F}_3(a_0^{(0)} + a_2^{(0)}) + \frac{\mathcal{F}_5}{2}(-a_0^{(0)} + a_2^{(0)} + a_4^{(0)})\\
&+\frac{\mathcal{F}_6}{2}(a_0^{(0)} + a_1^{(0)} - a_2^{(0)} + a_3^{(0)} - a_4^{(0)} + a_5^{(0)}) = 0\\
&\frac{\mathcal{F}_2}{2}(3a_0^{(1)} + 3a_1^{(1)} + a_2^{(1)} + a_3^{(1)} - a_4^{(1)} - a_5^{(1)}) + \mathcal{F}_3(a_0^{(1)} + a_2^{(1)}) + \frac{\mathcal{F}_5}{2}(-a_0^{(1)} + a_2^{(1)} + a_4^{(1)})\\
&+\frac{\mathcal{F}_6}{2}(a_0^{(1)} + a_1^{(1)} - a_2^{(1)} + a_3^{(1)} - a_4^{(1)} + a_5^{(1)}) = 0\\
&-\frac{i\mathcal{F}_1}{2\pi} + \frac{\mathcal{F}_1}{2}(3a_0^{(2)} + 3a_1^{(2)} + a_2^{(2)} + a_3^{(2)} - a_4^{(2)} - a_5^{(2)}) + \mathcal{F}_3(a_0^{(2)} + a_2^{(2)}) + \frac{\mathcal{F}_5}{2}(-a_0^{(2)} + a_2^{(2)} + a_4^{(2)})\\
&+\frac{\mathcal{F}_6}{2}(a_0^{(2)} + a_1^{(2)} - a_2^{(2)} + a_3^{(2)} - a_4^{(2)} + a_5^{(2)}) = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Similar equations can be written for $\mathcal{H}_{1,2,3,5,6}$. It is understood that equations (41)-(43) are to solved for x, ϕ in terms of $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{H}$ and τ. One has to look for integer solutions (for $\mathcal{F}_i$ and $\mathcal{H}_i$) of (40). For instance, to solve for $\mathcal{F}_i$, one sees that one ends up with three equations in five variables. Keeping any two fixed, one in general gets complex solutions in terms of the these fixed $\mathcal{F}_i$'s. One thus has to ensure that the imaginary parts vanish and the real parts turn out to be integral. One can show that it is not possible to achieve the same. This imples that near the conifold locus of the (orientifold of) the compact Calabi-Yau expressed as a degree-12 hypersurface in $\mathbf{WCP}^4[1,1,2,2,6]$, one can not obtain supersymmetric solutions that support fluxes. Note, however, for non supersymmetric solutions, for $\mathcal{H}^T\Pi \neq 0$, $\mathcal{F}^T\Pi \neq 0$, $D_\tau W = 0$ implies that $\tau = \frac{\mathcal{F}^T\bar{\Pi}}{\mathcal{H}^T\bar{\Pi}}$.

We now consider $D_x W = 0$.

$$D_x W = \partial_x W + \partial_x K W =$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(\mathcal{F}^T-\tau\mathcal{H}^T)\begin{pmatrix} -\frac{i}{2\pi} \\ \frac{1}{2}(3a_0^{(2)}+3a_1^{(2)}+a_2^{(2)}+a_3^{(2)}-a_4^{(2)}-a_5^{(2)} \\ a_0^{(2)}+a_2^{(2)} \\ \frac{1}{4\pi^2}(lnx+1)+a_0^{(2)} \\ \frac{1}{2}(-a_0^{(2)}+a_2^{(2)}+a_4^{(2)}) \\ \frac{1}{2}(a_0^{(2)}+a_1^{(2)}-a_2^{(2)}+a_3^{(2)}-a_4^{(2)}+a_5^{(2)}) \end{pmatrix} \\
&+(4\pi(\bar{x}ln|x|^2+\bar{x})+B+D\bar{x}+\bar{F}\bar{\phi})(\mathcal{F}^T-\tau\mathcal{H}^T)\begin{pmatrix} -\frac{ix}{2\pi} \\ \frac{1}{2}(3f_0+3f_1+f_2+f_3-f_4-f_5) \\ f_0+f_2 \\ \frac{x}{2\pi}lnx+f_0 \\ \frac{1}{2}(-f_0+f_2+f_4) \\ \frac{1}{2}(f_0+f_1-f_2+f_3-f_4+f_5) \end{pmatrix} \\
&=\frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{i\,(\mathcal{F}_1-\mathcal{H}_1\,\tau)}{\pi}+(3\,a_0^{(2)}+3\,a_1^{(2)}+a_2^{(2)}+a_3^{(2)}-a_4^{(2)}-a_5^{(2)})\,(\mathcal{F}_2-\mathcal{H}_2\,\tau)+2\,(a_0^{(2)}+a_2^{(2)})\,(\mathcal{F}_3-\mathcal{H}_3\,\tau)+ \\
&(-a_0^{(2)}+a_2^{(2)}+a_4^{(2)})\,(\mathcal{F}_5-\mathcal{H}_5\,\tau)+(a_0^{(2)}+a_1^{(2)}-a_2^{(2)}+a_3^{(2)}-a_4^{(2)}+a_5^{(2)})\,(\mathcal{F}_6-\mathcal{H}_6\,\tau)+ \\
&2\,(\mathcal{F}_4-\mathcal{H}_4\,\tau)\,(a_0^{(2)}+\frac{1+lnx}{4\,\pi^2})+(\frac{-i\,(\mathcal{F}_1-\mathcal{H}_1\,\tau)}{\pi}+ \\
&(6\,a_0^{(1)}+a_2^{(1)}+a_3^{(1)}-a_4^{(1)}-a_5^{(1)}+3\,a_0^{(2)}\,x+3\,a_1^{(2)}\,x+a_2^{(2)}\,x+a_3^{(2)}\,x- \\
&a_4^{(2)}\,x-a_5^{(2)}\,x+6\,a_0^{(1)}\,\phi+a_2^{(1)}\,\phi+a_3^{(1)}\,\phi-a_4^{(1)}\,\phi-a_5^{(1)}\,\phi)\;(\mathcal{F}_2-\mathcal{H}_2\,\tau)+ \\
&2\,(a_0^{(1)}+a_2^{(1)}+a_0^{(2)}\,x+a_2^{(2)}\,x+a_0^{(1)}\,\phi+a_2^{(1)}\,\phi)\,(\mathcal{F}_3-\mathcal{H}_3\,\tau)+ \\
&(-a_0^{(1)}+a_2^{(1)}+a_4^{(1)}-a_0^{(2)}\,x+a_2^{(2)}\,x+a_4^{(2)}\,x-a_0^{(1)}\,\phi+a_2^{(1)}\,\phi+a_4^{(1)}\,\phi)\,(\mathcal{F}_5-\mathcal{H}_5\,\tau) \\
&+(2\,a_0^{(1)}-a_2^{(1)}+a_3^{(1)}-a_4^{(1)}+a_5^{(1)}+a_0^{(2)}\,x+a_1^{(2)}\,x-a_2^{(2)}\,x+a_3^{(2)}\,x-a_4^{(2)}\,x+a_5^{(2)}\,x+2\,a_0^{(1)}\,\phi \\
&-a_2^{(1)}\,\phi+a_3^{(1)}\,\phi-a_4^{(1)}\,\phi+a_5^{(1)}\,\phi)\;(\mathcal{F}_6-\mathcal{H}_6\,\tau) \\
&+2\,(\mathcal{F}_4-\mathcal{H}_4\,\tau)\,(a_0^{(1)}+a_0^{(2)}\,x+a_0^{(1)}\,\phi+\frac{x\,lnx}{4\,\pi^2}))\,(B+2\,H,x+\bar{F}\,\bar{\phi}+\bar{x}\,(D+4\,\pi+4\,\pi\,ln|x|^2))\Big)=0
\end{aligned}
\tag{41}
$$

Near $x=0,\ \phi=0$, and for nonsupersymmetric solutions (for which $\mathcal{F}_4\neq 0,\ \mathcal{H}_4\neq 0$) one gets

$$
\begin{aligned}
lnx=\frac{4\,\pi^2}{\mathcal{F}_4-\mathcal{H}_4\,\tau}\Big(&\frac{\frac{-i}{2}\,(\mathcal{F}_1-\mathcal{H}_1\,\tau)}{\pi}-\frac{(3\,a_0^{(2)}+3\,a_1^{(2)}+a_2^{(2)}+a_3^{(2)}-a_4^{(2)}-a_5^{(2)})\,(\mathcal{F}_2-\mathcal{H}_2\,\tau)}{2}- \\
&(a_0^{(2)}+a_2^{(2)})\,(\mathcal{F}_3-\mathcal{H}_3\,\tau)-\frac{(-a_0^{(2)}+a_2^{(2)}+a_4^{(2)})\,(\mathcal{F}_5-\mathcal{H}_5\,\tau)}{2}-
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{(a_0^{(2)} + a_1^{(2)} - a_2^{(2)} + a_3^{(2)} - a_4^{(2)} + a_5^{(2)})\,(\mathcal{F}_6 - \mathcal{H}_6\,\tau)}{2} - \\
&\frac{B}{2}\,(\frac{-i\,(\mathcal{F}_1 - \mathcal{H}_1\,z)}{\pi} + (6\,a_0^{(0)} + a_2^{(0)} + a_3^{(0)} - a_4^{(0)} - a_5^{(0)})\,(\mathcal{F}_2 - \mathcal{H}_2\,\tau) + \\
&2\,(a_0^{(0)} + a_2^{(0)})\,(\mathcal{F}_3 - \mathcal{H}_3\,\tau) + 2\,a_0^{(0)}\,(\mathcal{F}_4 - \mathcal{H}_4\,\tau) + (-a_0^{(0)} + a_2^{(0)} + a_4^{(0)})\,(\mathcal{F}_5 - \mathcal{H}_5\,\tau) + \\
&(2\,a_0^{(0)} - a_2^{(0)} + a_3^{(0)} - a_4^{(0)} + a_5^{(0)})\,(\mathcal{F}_6 - \mathcal{H}_6\,\tau))\Big)
\end{aligned}
\tag{42}
$$

For nonsupersymmetric solutions, for which $\mathcal{F}_4 = \mathcal{H}_4 = 0$, one gets a linear equation in ϕ and x from (41); there will be no lnx or $ln\bar{x}$ terms.

Lets now consider $D_\phi W = 0$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&D_\phi W = \partial_\phi W + \partial_\phi K W \\
&= (\mathcal{F}^T - \tau\mathcal{H}^T)\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}(3a_0^{(1)} + 3a_1^{(1)} + a_2^{(1)} + a_3^{(1)} - a_4^{(1)} - a_5^{(1)}) \\ a_0^{(1)} + a_2^{(1)} \\ a_1^{(1)} \\ \frac{1}{2}(-a_0^{(1)} + a_2^{(1)} + a_4^{(1)} \\ \frac{1}{2}(a_0^{(1)} + a_1^{(1)} - a_2^{(1)} + a_3^{(1)} - a_4^{(1)} + a_5^{(1)} \end{pmatrix} \\
&+(C + E\bar{\phi} + F\bar{x} + 2G\phi)(\mathcal{F}^T - \tau\mathcal{H}^T)\begin{pmatrix} -\frac{ix}{2\pi} \\ \frac{1}{2}(3f_0 + 3f_1 + f_2 + f_3 - f_4 - f_5) \\ \frac{x}{4\pi^2}lnx + f_0 \\ \frac{1}{2}(-f_0 + f_2 + f_4) \\ \frac{1}{2}(f_0 + f_1 - f_2 + f_3 - f_4 + f_5) \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\Big((3\,a_0^{(1)} + 3\,a_1^{(1)} + a_2^{(1)} + a_3^{(1)} - a_4^{(1)} - a_5^{(1)})\,(\mathcal{F}_2 - \mathcal{H}_2\,\tau) + 2\,(a_0^{(1)} + a_2^{(1)})\,(\mathcal{F}_3 - \mathcal{H}_3\,\tau) + \\
&2\,a_0^{(1)}\,(\mathcal{F}_4 - \mathcal{H}_4\,\tau) + (-a_0^{(1)} + a_2^{(1)} + a_4^{(1)})\,(\mathcal{F}_5 - \mathcal{H}_5\,\tau) + (a_0^{(1)} + a_1^{(1)} - a_2^{(1)} + a_3^{(1)} - a_4^{(1)} + a_5^{(2)})\,(\mathcal{F}_6 - \mathcal{H}_6\,\tau) + \\
&(C + 2\,G\,\phi + F\,\bar{x} + e\,\bar{\phi})\,(\frac{-i\,(\mathcal{F}_1 - \mathcal{H}_1\,\tau)}{\pi} + (6\,a_0^{(0)} + a_2^{(0)} + a_3^{(0} - a_4^{(0)} - a_5^{(0)} + \\
&3\,a_0^{(2)}\,x + 3\,a_1^{(2)}\,x + a_2^{(2)}\,x + a_3^{(2)}\,x - a_4^{(2)}\,x - a_5^{(2)}\,x + 6\,a_0^{(1)}\,\phi + \\
&a_2^{(1)}\,\phi + a_3^{(1)}\,\phi - a_4^{(1)}\,\phi - a_5^{(1)}\,\phi)\ ,(\mathcal{F}_2 - \mathcal{H}_2\,\tau) + 2\,(a_0^{(0} + a_2^{(0} + a_0^{(2)}\,x + a_2^{(2)}\,x + \\
&a_0^{(1)}\,\phi + a_2^{(1)}\,\phi)\,(\mathcal{F}_3 - \mathcal{H}_3\,\tau) + (-a_0^{(0)} + a_2^{(0)} + a_4^{(0)} - a_0^{(2)}\,x + a_2^{(2)}\,x + a_4^{(2)}\,x - a_0^{(1)}\,\phi + a_2^{(1)}\,\phi + \\
&a_4^{(1)}\,\phi)\,(\mathcal{F}_5 - \mathcal{H}_5\,\tau) + (2\,a_0^{(0)} - a_2^{(0)} + a_3^{(0)} - a_4^{(0)} + \\
&a_5^{(0)} + a_0^{(2)}\,x + a_1^{(2)}\,x - a_2^{(2)}\,x + a_3^{(2)}\,x - a_4^{(2)}\,x + a_5^{(2)}\,x + 2\,a_0^{(1)}\,\phi -
\end{aligned}
$$

$$a_2^{(1)}\,\phi + a_3^{(1)}\,\phi - a_4^{(1)}\,\phi + a_5^{(1)}\,\phi)\ (\mathcal{F}_6 - \mathcal{H}_6\,\tau) + 2\,(\mathcal{F}_4 - \mathcal{H}_4\,\tau)\,(a_0^{(0)} + a_0^{(2)}\,x + a_0^{(1)}\,\phi + \frac{x\,lnx}{4\,\pi^2}))\Big) = 0 \tag{43}$$

Substituting (42) in (43), one gets a single complex constraint on ϕ and $\bar{\phi}$.

The fact that we are able to show that the conifold locus acts like an attractor in the complex structure moduli space is what can also be argued qualitatively given that the moduli space integral involves the curvature tensor and hence the contribution to the same will be dominated from locii where the curvature tensor diverges. As part of future work, one could try to solve equations (41) - (43) numerically and perform a Monte-Carlo simulation like [5] to verify, e.g., that the conifold locus indeed involves clustering of solutions, and hence acts like an attractor in the moduli space..

After completion of this work, we became aware of [8], which has overlap with our work.

Acknowledgement

One of us (AM) would like to thank S.Kachru and specially A.Giryavets and D.Joyce for several useful clarifications. We thank J.Conlon for pointing out a typo in the earlier version as well as a useful communication.

References

[1] G.L.Cardoso, G.Curio, G.Dall'Agata, D.Lüst, P.Manousselis and G.Zoupanos, *Non-Kähler Backgrounds and Their Five Torsion Classes*, Nucl. Phys. **B652** (2003) 5 [hep-th/0211118]; S.Gueieri, J.Louis, Micu and D.Waldram, *Mirror Symmetry in Generalized Calabi-Yau Compactifications*, Nucl. Phys. **B654** (203), 61 [hep-th/0211102]; S. Kachru, M. B. Schulz, P. K. Tripathy and S. P. Trivedi, *New supersymmetric string compactifications,* JHEP **0303**, 061 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0211182]. K.Becker, M.becker, K.Dasgupta and P.S.Green. *Compactifications of Heterotic Theory on Non-Kähler Complex Manifolds: I*, JHEP 0304(2003) 007 [hep-th/0301161]; K.becker and K.Dasgupta, *Heterotic Strings with Torsion*, JHEP 0211 (2002) 006 [arXiv:hep-th/0209077]; J. P. Gauntlett, D. Martelli and D. Waldram, *Superstrings with intrinsic torsion,* Phys. Rev. D **69**, 086002 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0302158].

[2] S. Ashok and M. R. Douglas, *Counting flux vacua,* JHEP **0401**, 060 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0307049].

[3] A. Sen, *Orientifold limit of F-theory vacua,* Phys. Rev. D **55**, 7345 (1997) [arXiv:hep-th/9702165].

[4] A. Giryavets, S. Kachru, P. K. Tripathy and S. P. Trivedi, *Flux compactifications on Calabi-Yau threefolds,* JHEP **0404**, 003 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0312104].

[5] A. Giryavets, S. Kachru and P. K. Tripathy, *On the taxonomy of flux vacua,* arXiv:hep-th/0404243.

[6] P. Candelas, X. C. De La Ossa, P. S. Green and L. Parkes, *A Pair Of Calabi-Yau Manifolds As An Exactly Soluble Superconformal Theory*, Nucl. Phys. B **359**, 21 (1991); P. Candelas, X. De La Ossa, A. Font, S. Katz and D. R. Morrison, *Mirror symmetry for two parameter models. I,* Nucl. Phys. B **416**, 481 (1994) [arXiv:hep-th/9308083].

[7] P. Berglund, P. Candelas, X. De La Ossa, A. Font, T. Hubsch, D. Jancic and F. Quevedo, *Periods for Calabi-Yau and Landau-Ginzburg vacua,* Nucl. Phys. B **419**, 352 (1994) [arXiv:hep-th/9308005].

[8] J. Conlon and F. Quevedo, *On the Explicit Construction and Statistics and of Calabi-Yau Flux Vacua*, hep-th/0409215.